D618
C532
V. 25
MAR - 3 1958
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY

The Divinity School News

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Vol. XXV FEBRUARY 1, 1958 No. 1

Published quarterly by the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, 5801 Ellis Ave., February 1, May 1, August 1, and November 1. Entered as second-class matter, March 20, 1934, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of February 28, 1925, authorized April 18, 1934.

[The following paper was presented by Dr. Gibson Winter at the Federated Theological Faculty Retreat, October 21–23, 1957. Dr. Winter is Assistant Professor of Ethics and Society of the Federated Theological Faculty at the University of Chicago.—EDITOR.]

TOWARD A PROTESTANT ETHIC OF MARRIAGE

OUR task in this consultation has been defined by the question, "Can There Be a Protestant Doctrine of Family Life?"[1] This particular paper is intended to review the historical development of ideas on family life. In addition, an attempt is made to outline an ethic of institutions. We shall confine ourselves to the historical development leading up to the conflict of the reformers with the papacy. This actually includes the classical developments of thought on family questions in both Protestant and Roman Catholic branches. During subsequent centuries, Protestants and Roman Catholics worked out compromises in the spheres of their religious influence, and there was little pressure to develop their theological positions. However, changes in family structure and developing family research have once again focused a spotlight on the doctrine of the family. We find ourselves, therefore, taking up some of the unfinished business of the Reformation.

The development leading to the Reformation positions on family matters have been studied primarily by jurists. Conflicts in civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions have made this a particularly interesting question to students of law. We are indebted, therefore, to the work of men like Emil Friedberg and Adhemar Esmein for extensive research on the development of a theology of marriage. They were interested in problems of legal interpretation. Our interests fall more toward questions of theology and ethics. Nevertheless, these interests intersect in the formulation of the grounds on which the Church claimed jurisdiction over marital questions. We shall follow Esmein's thesis up to the time of the Reformation, and then explore the implications of the Protestant position which emerged in the sixteenth century. The ad-

[1] Consultation of a special committee of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

vantage in this procedure is that it may simplify our review of the Church's teaching on family matters. The danger is that it may simplify matters too much.

The juristic thesis is relatively simple. The Christian Church of the West did not gain full jurisdiction over marital questions until the tenth and eleventh centuries. In preceding centuries, various theological grounds were used for guiding the Church's discipline of family life. Biblical teachings, a sacramental conception of the marital relationship, and natural law principles were applied. Such interpretations were set in the context of the Roman, Gothic, Frankish, Germanic, and other systems of law and customary usage. However, the canonical jurists of the twelfth century seized the sacramental conception as the firmest ground for juridical decisions, so that the sacramental conception of marriage took the center of the stage after the twelfth century. Thanks to the canonists, ecclesiastical jurisdiction on family questions rested on the sacramental conception in the time of the Reformation. Consequently, Martin Luther, John Calvin, and other reformers had to grapple with this sacramental conception if they were to re-establish a biblical view of marriage and family life. Needless to say, the Roman Catholic Church considered the sacramental conception a fundamentally biblical view.

Since Esmein's thesis has not been discussed in contemporary writing on the theology of the family, it will be reviewed here in abbreviated form. At the risk of repeating a story which is familiar to some, the building blocks of this thesis will be exposed to view.

THE SACRAMENTAL CONCEPTION OF MARRIAGE

Augustine's reference to marriage as a sacrament is usually considered the most important early source for the sacramental conception. Tertullian and Ambrose had used the expression, but the great prestige of Augustine seems to have given the imprimatur to the notion. Augustine's famous formulation of the goods of marriage as children, fidelity, and sacrament molded most of medieval thought.[2] He did not use sacrament in a precise sense in this connection according to the translators of his treatises on marriage, but he rested the indissolubility of marriage on its sacramental nature. The fundamental idea derives from the similarity which is drawn in Ephesians between the relationship of husband and wife in marriage to the relationship of Christ with the Church.

[2] Emil Friedberg, *Das Recht Eheschliessung* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1865), pp. 153 f.; Adhemar Esmein, *Le Mariage en droit canonique* (Paris: Larose et Forcel, 1891), I, 65; Saint Augustine, *Treatises on Marriage and Other Subjects,* ed. Roy J. Deferrari (New York, 1955), pp. 4 f., 47 f., 58 f.

For no man hates his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it, as Christ does the Church, because we are members of his body. "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one." This is a great mystery, and I take it to mean Christ and the church; . . . [Ephesians 5:29–32].

This notion was developed in the later medieval period in part because the Vulgate translates the Greek *mysterion* as *sacramentum* in this particular case. Whatever Augustine may have meant in his use of the notion of sacrament in marriage, the analogy in Ephesians became the dominant motif in the middle ages. Hincmar of Rheims in the latter half of the ninth century extended the sacramental theory by drawing a parallel between sexual intercourse in marriage and the incarnation of Christ. The physical union of marriage thus represents the incarnation.[3] This notion was later extended so that betrothal represented the love of God for His people and *copula carnalis* represented the actual incarnation.

Augustine had not applied his sacramental understanding to unbelievers, and in this he was followed by later thinkers. The sacrament of marriage applies only under the New Law to baptized persons. Children and fidelity or chastity apply to all men as part of the natural order, but baptism is requisite for the grace of the sacrament in marriage. Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas also held this position on the limitation of sacramental marriage to Christians.[4] Consequently, absolute indissolubility only applies to the marriage of baptized persons. Indissolubility and sacrament were linked together from the time of Augustine until the Council of Trent.

There were innumerable elaborations of natural law and divine law which argued for the indissolubility of marriage. Such arguments had neither the absoluteness nor the freedom from exceptions to suit the jurists. The jurists appropriated the sacramental view as allowing for the fewest exceptions and making for the clearest judgments. They attempted to reconcile these levels of law from natural to divine law up to the New Law, but exceptions could always be argued according to natural law. For example, it has often been argued that offspring are the chief end of marriage and the only purpose by which sexual intercourse can be sinless. If this be true, then arguments arise as to whether the sick, impotent, recalcitrant, and those called to a religious life are bound to marriage. In contrast to such hair-splitting, the jurists could affirm that husband and wife could no more be separated than Christ could be separated from the Church. Man cannot alter the acts of God. In

[3] Esmein, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

[4] Esmein, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

this way, they also avoided the difficulty that Moses allowed divorce. Moses could allow under the old dispensation what was not possible under the New Law.

The Council of Trent confirmed this position in the dogmatic canon on the sacrament of matrimony.

> Canon I. If anyone saith that matrimony is not truly and properly one of the seven sacraments of the evangelic law, [a sacrament] instituted by Christ the Lord; but that it has been invented by men in the Church; and that it does not confer grace; let him be anathema.[5]

It should not be assumed that this canon was uncontested in preparatory discussion. Massarellus relates the discussions of theologians on the origin of this sacrament in the tradition of the Church.[6] The important issue is the final formulation of Trent, since this became authoritative for the Roman Church. In fact, publication and interpretation was kept in the Vatican to avoid episcopal discretion. In 1564, Pius IV instituted the *Congregatio Concilii* in order to supervise the execution of the work of the council, and this body became the organ through which law was formulated.

The Roman Church still holds the position of Trent on the character of marriage, and derives the ecclesiastical jurisdiction over marriage from this sacramental notion.

> How great is the dignity of chaste wedlock, Venerable Brethren, may be judged best from this that Christ our Lord, Son of the Eternal Father, having assumed the nature of fallen man, not only, with His loving desire of compassing the redemption of our race, ordained it in an especial manner as the principle and foundation of domestic society and therefore of all human intercourse, but also raised it to the rank of a truly and great sacrament of the New Law, restored it to the original purity of its divine institution, and accordingly entrusted all its discipline and care to His spouse the Church.[7]

We have, therefore, a continual, if not uncontested, development of sacramental thinking from patristic times to the most modern statements of Rome on the nature of matrimony. As can be seen from the statement in *Casti Connubii* which we have quoted, the jurisdiction of the Church over marriage depends upon the sacramental interpretation. Marriage comes under the New Law. If marriage is simply an arrangement in accord with natural law for domestic society, it need only follow the principles of nature in accord with appropriate jurisdiction. The situation is quite different in the case of a

[5] *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees, Authorized Translations* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1912), p. 161; cf. Friedberg, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

[6] Esmein, *op. cit.*, II, 153. All other questions were deduced from this principle which was settled in preparatory consultations.

[7] *Casti Connubii, Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XI* (New York: Paulist Press, 1941), p. 1.

sacrament. Marriage can no more be subjected to civil authority than Baptism or the Eucharist. Once marriage has been incorporated within the sacramental system, it comes under ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) had declared matrimony a sacrament, and that position was confirmed at Trent. It can be seen from the Tridentine canon that this is not a general use of the term "sacrament." Matrimony is conceived as a means of grace instituted by Christ and operative under the New Law.

THE PROTEST OF THE REFORMERS

The reformers rejected this position of the Roman Church on marriage. In fact, the discussions and formulations of the Council of Trent were largely attempts to answer the criticisms of the reformers. The most distinctive positions were those of Martin Luther and John Calvin, although Zwingli and others were in general accord with their views.[8] Before considering the views of Luther and Calvin, it should be noted that several broad considerations were involved in the attacks on the Roman position. Luther and Calvin rejected the Roman claim that celibacy was a higher order of life. In fact, it is generally known that they considered the corruptions among the clergy a result of the blasphemous attempt to transform the special vocation of celibacy into a standard for the priesthood. Furthermore, the Roman hierarchy had developed a complicated system of impediments, dispensations, and regulations in the field of marriage. After centuries of pastoral discipline over the family, the Church fell heir to the civil jurisdiction over marriage in the eleventh century. The rigid claims of Church discipline became the law of the land. The Fourth Lateran Council had made some modifications in the impediments arising from consanguinity, affinity, and spiritual relationships through baptism, but the total system was unwieldy, rigid, and in many cases a source of bitter strife.

Luther and Calvin were attacking a total system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction when they questioned the sacramental character of marriage. The only way in which any part of the system could be touched was by questioning the sacrament. This accounts for the extreme formulation at the Council of Trent on a matter which was recognizably uncertain in the tradition of the Church. Throughout the medieval period, the Church had acquiesced in divorces, although her own norm had generally been the indissoluble union.[9]

[8] Friedberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 183 f.

[9] Esmein, *op. cit.*, II, 61.

At Trent the most rigid sacramental position was stated as dogma against the proclamations and actions of the reformers.

Emil Friedberg points out that Martin Luther moved slowly from a traditional position on marriage to the view that it was a high state of life and yet a worldly matter.[10] Certainly in his Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Luther is quite categorical on the question.

> What is the proper procedure for us nowadays in matters of marriage and divorce? I have said that this should be left to the lawyers and made subject to the secular government. For marriage is a rather secular and outward thing, having to do with wife and children, house and home, and with other matters that belong to the realm of the government, all of which have been completely subjected to reason (Gen. 1:28).[11]

Luther found it extremely difficult to accept divorce for Christians, although he does concede it for adultery or desertion and is willing to abide by the decisions of the secular powers.[12] Similar views are expressed in his Table Talks and in his discussion of Clandestine Marriage.[13] We need not enter here into the discussion of the complexities of clandestine marriage beyond mentioning the fact that Luther opposed the Roman validation of clandestine marriage over a later public marriage. It is interesting that the Council of Trent came by another path to the same conclusion in 1563, although not without argument. In fact, Luther's attack on the Clandestine Marriage was a body blow to the whole Roman system, since Luther contradicted the sacramental notion of marriage by declaring a clandestine marriage null. Luther could not agree that consent or consent with copulation made a marriage. Marriage is a public matter for the community, and is not valid in secret. This is one way of invalidating the sacramental adequacy of the marital union in and of itself. Trent ended in the same position with the decree *De Clandestinis*. The Tridentine decision on clandestine marriage was bitterly contested, and yet such secret marriages were intolerable to the community. Their recognition was jeopardizing the general acceptance of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Nevertheless, no compromise on this issue could escape the acknowledgment that the marital union of baptized persons did not bear a sacramental character of itself, even though it fully met the requirements of all strictures on personal qualification of the spouses as to relationship and adequacy.[14]

[10] Friedberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 157 ff. Friedberg cites Luther's sermon "Von ehelichen Stand" in 1519 as representing his early sacramental conception of marriage.

[11] "The Sermon on the Mount," *Luther's Works,* ed. Jaroslav Pelikan, XXI, 93.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 96.

[13] Martin Luther, "Von Ehesachen," *Ausgewahlte Werke* (München: Kaiser-Verlag, 1952), V, 213 f.

[14] Esmein, *op. cit.*, chap. iv, pp. 209–37.

We cannot pursue the detail of this controversy here, since the clandestine marriage was an extremely complicated aspect of medieval marriage. It represented one of the deepest fissures in the sacramental view. Martin Luther laid this issue bare in his attack on the validation of the clandestine marriage by the Roman jurisdiction. He also revealed his own conviction that marriage was a part of the total life of a community and could only be evaluated in that context. Furthermore, he revealed by implication that he had discarded the traditional position on the sacramental character of the marital union. The Council of Trent could not escape coming to the same conclusion on clandestinity at which Luther had arrived, but the canonists attempted to salvage the sacramental conception of marriage out of the debacle. In principle, they had dropped the sacramental conception by requiring witnesses and parochial enactment for a valid marriage. It could no longer be claimed that the union of male and female was indissoluble simply because it represented the union of Christ with His Church. If this union did not occur under sanctioned circumstances, it was no longer sacramental. Hence, it was not sacramental in its essential character.

Luther's fundamental opposition to Rome on marriage was that the pope had transformed a secular matter into an ecclesiastical issue. Thus, he had pre-empted jurisdiction over a civil and public concern. Marriage was still under God's ultimate authority for Martin Luther, but this was quite a different thing from the hierocratic rule of the Roman jurisdiction.[15]

John Calvin was even more critical than Luther of the Roman position on the sacramental character of marriage.[16] He says in the Institutes:

> For it is required in a sacrament, not only that it be a work of God, but that it be an external ceremony appointed by God for the confirmation of a promise. That there is nothing of this kind in matrimony even children can judge.
>
> There is also another absurdity in their doctrine. They affirm that the grace of the Holy Spirit is conferred in every sacrament; they acknowledge that the conjugal intercourse is a sacrament; yet they deny that the Holy Spirit is ever present in that intercourse.
>
> It may truly be affirmed that, when they made matrimony into a sacrament, they only sought a den of all abominations. For, when they had once established this notion, they assumed to themselves the cognizance of matrimonial causes; for matrimony was a spiritual thing, and not to be meddled with before lay judges.[17]

John Calvin interpreted the reference in Ephesians to marriage and the church as a similitude. On this basis, he considered it ridiculous to treat mar-

[15] G. W. Forell, *Faith Active in Love* (New York: American Press, 1954), p. 127.

[16] John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion,* trans. John Allen (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board, 1936), Book IV, chap. xix; cf. also Georgia Harkness, *John Calvin, the Man and His Ethic* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1931), chap. vii.

[17] *Institutes,* pp. 766–69.

riage as a sacrament.[18] He points out that theft becomes a sacrament if the similitudes of the Bible must be treated as sacraments. Calvin considered the jurisdiction over marriage a civil question, although he did not consider the civil authorities as independent of the rule of God. However, he did consider the union of male and female a holy union, consequently he claimed that ministers of the true faith were the proper agents for God in solemnizing a marriage. The Dutch Calvinists and New England Puritans tended to follow the logic of his position on the civil character of marriage. They tended to treat marriage as a civil contract.[19] Calvin never carried his position to this logical conclusion.

Despite the strict moralism of the Genevan reform, Calvin allowed several grounds for divorce which are notably liberal. He allowed divorce in cases of adultery for the wife as well as the husband. He also allowed divorce for desertion. He permitted divorce for disparities in religion, a problem growing out of the Roman Catholic and Reformed allegiances of men and women in the Geneva community. He also treated incapacity for sexual intercourse as adequate ground for annulment and remarriage.[20] In all these cases, remarriage was not only allowed but encouraged, since marriage served to offset the lusts and desires. Luther and Calvin considered the Roman practice of granting separation without allowing remarriage as contravening a fundamental purpose of marriage which had been attested by St. Paul. The Roman position had also emphasized the importance of marriage in controlling lust, but this principle was gradually subordinated to the indissolubility of the sacrament. If men and women were separated but could not remarry, they were exposed to the temptations which marriage was intended to overcome. The attack on separation without remarriage was, thus, an oblique attack on the indissolubility of the sacramental marriage.

We have neglected the developments in England, because the Anglican reformation did not break fundamentally with the Roman Catholic conception of marriage and marital jurisdiction. The Puritan movement in England, on the other hand, was a very distinctive development. Puritan thought seems to have been influenced primarily by Bullinger of Zurich whose book, *The Christian State of Matrimony,* was available in English by 1541. Bullinger undoubtedly had a profound influence on Anglican thought, but the

[18] Harkness, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 147–56.

ecclesiastical situation did not reflect that influence.[21] Roland Bainton has discussed the stress on physical and spiritual companionship in the Puritan development.[22] This development has come to fruition in the past few generations of the American family. However, it does not represent a fundamental theological development in the doctrine of marriage, although the stress on the erotic enjoyment of marriage struck a new note. We cannot do more than mention this strand of thought, recognizing that there are important aspects of marital doctrine which are not included in the sacramental controversy.

Furthermore, this compressed account of the conflict over a sacramental interpretation of marriage distorts to a degree the complexity of the historical development. The Roman Catholic jurisdiction over marriage was largely won by default. A dual jurisdiction of civil and ecclesiastical authorities dealt with marital questions through most of the medieval period. The Church took interest in these matters out of concern for the morality of its members. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction took control only after the breakdown of political authority in the tenth century. The legal and cultural conflicts of this medieval period were extremely complex. It would be erroneous to suggest that the Church deliberately set out to control that potpourri of customs and practices. It seems quite evident, however, that the papacy was loath to surrender a jurisdiction which it may never have sought. This reflects the common phenomenon of institutional inertia. It is much easier to block the assimilation of power by an institution than it is to remove power which has been appropriated.

Acknowledging this oversimplification of issues, it is fair to say that the conflict over the sacramental conception was *the* issue on marriage. There is sharp cleavage in the sixteenth century over the nature of marriage, but there is little elaboration of the Protestant doctrine. The Roman Church crystallized its sacramental position at Trent. The reformers had protested this fundamental position, falling back on the teachings of the Bible, the concept of the three uses of the law, and the conception of orders.

Several changes in Western society have raised again the question of an ethic of marriage. Fundamental changes in social structure have altered the shape and function of the family. Traditional views of the family have been questioned. Interfaith marriages and divorces for incompatibility have led to some soul-searching among religious leaders. Roland Bainton suggests that

21 Roland M. Frye, "The Teachings of Classical Puritanism on Conjugal Love," *Studies in the Renaissance,* II (1955), 149 f.

22 Roland Bainton, *What Christianity Says about Sex, Love and Marriage* (New York: Association Press, 1957), p. 107.

emphasis be placed on the sacramental character of marriage in order to lend stability to marital arrangements.[23] Emil Brunner speaks strongly of the crisis in marriage, urging that a sacramental notion be dropped but that a new ethic of marriage be developed.[24] In brief, there is a theological crisis over marriage, and we find ourselves taking up the Protestant ethic of marriage where the reformers left it. Too many developments have come in biblical study and social science to permit a simple restatement of the position of the reformers. Nevertheless, their position is the logical point of departure for a Protestant ethic.

TOWARD A PROTESTANT ETHIC OF MARRIAGE

The medieval ecclesiastical system extended its control over society by sacralizing the institutionalized relationships of the community. By the term "sacralize" is meant the incorporation of familial, political, and economic relationships under ecclesiastical control. This process created opposition among princes and merchants. In fact it was only in family and education that the Church gained full control. This era was broken by the reformers. Is there a theological justification for ecclesiastical jurisdiction on such matters? Must we return to a *corpus christianum* once again?

The answer to these questions is to be found in a theology of social institutions. Martin Luther gave his interpretation of institutions in terms of the orders of creation. We shall discuss this question in terms of structures rather than orders. This frees us from notions of natural law and brings us into contact with sociological theory.

If we follow Jacques Ellul's analysis in his book, *Le Fondement théologique du Droit,* we conceive of "institutions" (Ellul's term) as organic structures of existence which are created by God for the maintenance of life. These structures are not creations of human will through contract or intention. These structures have ends, but man cannot delimit or even define these ends clearly. He only senses their purposefulness for life. The structures involve sanctions and expectations which are external to the persons who participate in them. They are given with human existence even as the trees, the light, and man himself. There is a universal and mysterious character to these structures. They are created by God. They are limited in number. Ellul would speak primarily of marriage, property, exchange, and the State. It seems wiser to leave the number open, recognizing that such a structure is

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] Emil Brunner, *The Divine Imperative,* trans. Olive Wyon (London: Lutterworth Press, 1937), p. 341.

partly defined by its strategic significance for a society. For example, education is an independent structure of strategic significance in the West. It has had this significance in very few societies.

Structures are almost infinitely variable in their patterning. Patterns shift in accordance with the exigencies of particular situations. The essential structure, however, has an invariant character. A structure is by definition a universal, although its importance may vary with societies. The structures are never experienced in human society except as patterned institutions which reflect clearly or inadequately their intended character. They are given to man by God for the preservation of life.

The structure of marriage is the conjunction of sexual privilege and economic co-operation in the nuclear family. By nuclear family is usually meant the husband and wife with their dependent children. This nexus of sexuality and the nuclear family is one of the few cultural universals, as George Murdock has pointed out in his book, *Social Structure*. It seems obvious to assume sexual privilege between husband and wife in the nuclear family, but there is no reason for such an assumption in view of the variability of patterning in cultures. We are dealing here with one of the givens of human existence—a given which cannot be explained from instinct, heredity, or any other principle. This nexus is as inexplicable as life itself. We simply know that we do not experience human existence apart from the nuclear family and, where we encounter human existence, we meet the nuclear family with its sexual privileges. Thus, marriage as an institution joins together sexuality, procreation, and co-operation in a communal group.

This is a very formal conception. It states that God has given certain invariable structures of existence in and through which men exist as human. Man can elaborate and modify the patterning of these structures in accord with his needs and the exigencies of a changing situation. However, man risks destruction if he violates the fundamental structures. For example, the separation of sexual privilege from the nuclear family is a constant temptation. This violates a structure of existence. Polygamy, on the other hand, is a kind of patterning of nuclear families. It may exist without violating this structure.

God creates and sustains life through the structures of existence. Man encounters God within these structures. This accords with Luther's conception of the inescapable encounter with God in the orders. However, the Church's concern with the family suggests a peculiar sacredness to this institution. Can we draw a distinction between marriage and the purchase of a sack of pota-

toes? Are these institutions all on one level in the Christian view of society?

Institutions differ in their significance for personal existence. At least, recent considerations of the interpersonal character of existence would suggest this. The institution of marriage is central to existence. At a somewhat further remove we would expect to find the institutions of law and legitimized power. At the furthest remove we should expect to find the economic institutions of property and exchange. This continuum from central to peripheral institutions is generated around the criterion of cruciality to personal existence. Those structures which are most crucial to the creation of personal being through interpersonal dialogue participate most directly in the permanent and unchanging patterns. No patterning in human existence is absolute, and yet these central structures have a permanence and resistance to voluntary control which is much greater than that of the political and economic institutions. Human contrivance would be most destructive in familial patterning and most appropriate in the economic sphere.

This distinction between institutions as to strategic significance for personal existence cannot be drawn absolutely. Nevertheless, we are constantly pushed toward some such notion by contemporary developments in social science. It is quite evident that children can be fed, housed, kept warm and disciplined without being brought to personal existence. In fact, it is clear that children perish physically if they are not addressed and given personal warmth and affection. The dialogue of parent with child and the concern which accompanies real dialogue cannot be removed without destroying personal existence. This fact presents a dilemma for theology, since it makes it rather evident that God creates personal being through personal interactions. God rests his work on man. This can only mean theologically that our existence is a gift of God *through* others. The structure in which this gift of life is given requires permanence and continuity. This need is much less urgent for other institutions. We move from the least alterable and transitory structures at the center of existence to the most flexible, alterable, and transitory arrangements on the periphery. This movement is, thus, from dialogue and interpersonal relationships within a nuclear family through educational to political and economic arrangements. We can express this concretely by distinguishing the marital covenant from the business contract. Our common law still recognizes this distinction, since the dissolution of the marital covenant is not granted without good cause. The mutual agreement of the parties is not a sufficient cause.

This continuum of institutional significance from the center to the periph-

ery of human existence is confirmed by the analogies in the Bible. The idea of the Word of God, God's address to a man in Christ, and His action for man in His Son, interprets man's relation to God in dialogic terms. The address by another person is the essential means of personal being. Apart from this address, we know of no personal being. Biblical dialogue begins with the call, "Adam where art thou?" In our alienation from God and from one another, the restoration of personal being or human existence in God's image comes about through God's address to us in Christ. We are called from death into life by God. The Bible can use the analogy of language since dialogue is at the center of personal existence. In fact, Christ sets the human word in its true place.

The analogy between marriage and God's Covenant with His people runs all through the Bible. The application in Ephesians 5 to Christ and the Church is only one of many different ways in which this analogy occurs. The analogy is appropriate because there is a permanence and fidelity in the structure of the marital covenant which is, at least, a shadow of the fidelity of God to His people.

Permanence and continuity, then, characterize those institutions which operate at the center of personal existence. Roger Mehl expresses this by saying that fidelity is the soul of communication (see his book, *La Rencontre d'autrui*). He then goes on to suggest that monogamy is the profoundest human expression of true communication. The particularity, exclusiveness, faithfulness, and trust of fully personal communication achieves its fullest expression in monogamous marriage. Thus, a Christian could argue for monogamy, and certainly in Western culture this is not even a question for discussion. The difficult issue is the role of the Church in sustaining certain values and claims in the institutions. If we object to ecclesiastical control of institutions, do we have a serious alternative through which the Church's action bears on these structures of existence?

The community of the New Covenant which comes into being through Christ's work makes possible the fulfillment of life in the institutions. The Church is conceived here as the actualization in history through the Holy Spirit of the presence of Christ. Thus, faith is *ipso facto* membership in the community of the New Covenant, whether it be consciously acknowledged as such or not. The task of this community is to bear witness to Christ through the proclamation of His work for man and through existing as a community in the world. The task of the Church is not to substitute itself for the structures of existence nor to compete with them as one institution alongside

others. The redeemed order of life appears at the end of time. The task of the Church is to uphold in those institutions the rights of man which God affirms in His Covenant and to recall by word and action the true source of life in these institutions. The Church upholds life in the "time between" for the sake of man's salvation, and restoration.

If we return to marriage, which is our main concern in this discussion of institutions, we can see that the Church upholds fidelity in the marital covenant as essential to the structure of marriage. On the other hand, the Church does not legislate fidelity. It lends support to fidelity through prayer and pastoral concern. A solemnization of matrimony in the Church is a witness to the source of true authority in marriage. It should not arrogate to the Church either jurisdiction or legislative power over marital relationships. The Church is not called to have its own disciplinary legislation for divorce and remarriage except as an extreme and prophetic protest against a society which has violated the fundamental structure of marriage.

The distinction between institutions along lines of centrality for personal existence has strategic implications for the relations of the Church to different institutions. Institutions which rest on interpersonal dialogue and create personal being through interpersonal existence derive their fullest ministry through the existence of the community of the Covenant. Thus, participation in the Covenant Community is the medium of the Church's ministry to the most fully personal structures. A family achieves freedom and direction for its life as family primarily through its life within the Covenant Community. This coincidence of interpersonal communities finds expression in the offices of the Church's pastoral ministry—confirmation, matrimony, visitation of the sick, and burial of the dead. These familial events with their joinings and separations are conjoined to the ceremonial life of the Covenant Community.

By contrast, the institutions which lie toward the periphery of the fully personal offer a more difficult problem to the Covenant Community. The political and economic are not less important to life as a whole. They represent the central dialogic structure of being through their character as reciprocity. We are not simply standing Karl Marx on his head. In fact, the political and economic constantly threaten to control all spheres and tend to violate personal existence within their own structures. They tend to lose their dialogic character of reciprocity. The Church upholds life within these structures by affirming the rights of man which God affirms in His Covenant. The equality of men before God in His Covenant, the claims of man to justice

without respect of position, the sighing of the prisoner, the cry of the captive, the claim of the oppressed, and the right of widowed, poor, or orphaned—these are the claims of life under the crushing forces of power, prestige, arrogance, and exploitation. The Church maintains right in the name of Covenant for all structures of existence. It contributes to the peripheral institutions primarily by the affirmation of right and the prophetic claim. It contributes to the more personal primarily by its existence as community.

The process of social differentiation by which institutions ramify into independent bureaucratic structures has created peculiar problems for contemporary Christianity. The collapse of the *Corpus Christianum* was the almost inevitable corollary to this process of differentiation. We see the ambiguity of the Church's position in her ministry to the educational institutions. Education like other institutions has usually been a sub-structure of familial community. The process of social differentiation has extended and separated this structure so that it has now become an institution in its own right. The Church finds it difficult to decide whether this is a familial structure which should be conjoined with its own covenant life or not. There is no simple principle by which this ambiguity can be overcome. Differentiation leads to the erection of interstitial structures with which the Church must cope both by its existence as community and by its affirmation of right—in this case the right to truth, dignity, and opportunity. It does seem evident, however, that the sphere of theological education imposes particular obligations upon the Church's interpersonal existence as a community. This clearly presents a peculiar problem in the Federated Theological Faculty.

It is a constant temptation for the Church to define its life by a redeemed order of law and to maintain this order as a New Law within its life as Community. This is the character of the Roman development of sacramental marriage. It is to a degree the sectarian solution of the moral dilemma. The sectarian solution is to absolutize "sacred" norms of behavior. When the sectarian solution is imposed on a culture it becomes totalitarianism. The Church's task for the institutions is to proclaim the Gospel from which proceeds conviction of sin and assurance of grace. This proclamation is a summons to uphold life within the institutions and to hear the cry of the oppressed. The moment that the Church arrogates the prerogatives of institutions and establishes an alternative order in the name of Redemption, it transforms the redeeming work of Christ into the privilege of ecclesiastical control. The reformation only started the process of freeing human society

from ecclesiastical control. This process is sometimes called secularization. It might better be called the "de-sacralizing" of the institutions.

CONCLUSION

This approach to an ethic of marriage moves beyond Luther at a few crucial points. First, history and the study of culture have made it clear that the patterning of institutions is extremely variable. Luther's rather conservative acceptance of institutional arrangements must be discarded. Second, it is now apparent that personal disposition and love can only find free play where institutional arrangements permit their expression. Social change comes through persons, but only as those persons reshape institutions. We have seen ample evidence of this on the question of Negro education. A focus on individual faith inevitably leads to pietism whether of the German or the Billy Graham variety. Third, Luther's essential insight that marriage has a "worldly" character seems a valid attack on the Roman development. The Roman sacralizing of institutional existence is a violation of the integrity of the structures of existence. On the other hand, institutions vary in their strategic significance to personal existence. The nearer they approach to the center of human existence, the more they represent the fundamental dialogue of man with God and bear directly on the covenanted life of God's people. The family as community intersects much more closely than other structures with the interpersonal life of the covenant community. With all its errors, the medieval church bore witness to this fact about family life.

A theology of institutions must provide for significant interchanges between institutionalized systems. Luther depended upon the prophetic preaching of the Church and the faith of individuals for these interchanges. Calvin depended largely on the prestige of the ministry and its preaching as well as the role of the magistrate in implementing the laws of God. Neither of these systems of interchange is really effective in our time. If we reject the Roman attempt to control the functioning of institutions through political power, we confront a serious dilemma in a pluralistic society. The use of pressure groups and lobbies can provide some political recourse, but the institutional spheres of existence tend to become isolated from one another without mechanisms for interchange.

The problem of interchanges between institutional systems is the most serious question facing a social ethic today. This dilemma has led to the stirrings of a serious lay movement which has momentarily been swamped by religious organization. A serious lay movement is a sign of a new thrust to-

ward the shaping of institutional existence. No social ethic can provide a substitute for the actual interrelations of the Church and the structures of society. When the Church becomes a collectivity of organized groups which are struggling for their own institutional survival, social ethics has been replaced by the technics of development and organizational expansion. This is the death knell for the Covenant Community and the new era of organizational pietism.

GIBSON WINTER

FROM THE DEAN'S DESK

From all reports, the November Roger Williams Fellowship Conference was one of the best to date. Three major Christian doctrines were discussed under the general title: "Liberalism and Neo-Orthodoxy; a Conversation." Some of us knew, or thought we knew, that our lectures would not be classifiable neatly under either of the terms separated by the "and." On this score we were certainly right. We were gratified to note the remarkable degree of basic agreement in theological judgment and method among the lecturers and to discern further signs of the freshness and creativity of theological thought in our day. The designations "liberal" and "Neo-Orthodox" are less and less relevant terms to describe this phenomenon. A limited number of copies of the major addresses given at the conference are available for distribution (cost: $1.00). Write to Mrs. Lawson of the Divinity School.

Registration for the autumn quarter in the Divinity School and in the Federation as a whole was the highest on record. You may be interested in the following picture of enrolment for that quarter:

	Divinity School	CTS	Meadville	DDH	Totals
D.B.	42	101	15	17	175
M.A.	44	8	1	0	53
Ph.D.	114	4	1	3	122
Other	12	11	2	0	25
Totals	212	124	19	20	375

Church Affiliation	Divinity School	Federation	Total
Baptist	50	7	57
Episcopal	12	1	13
Presbyterian	34	18	52
Methodist	21	22	43
Congregational	9	57	66
Evangelical & Reformed	3	6	9
Evangelical United Brethren	2	2	4
Church of God	4	0	4
Mennonite	6	1	7
Unitarian	3	19	22
Serbian Orthodox	1	0	1
Pilgrim Holiness	1	0	1
United Church of Canada	1	0	1
Church of South India	2	0	2
Evangelical Covenant	1	0	1
Friends	2	0	2
Church of Jesus	1	0	1
Eastern Orthodox	2	0	2
Church of the Brethren	1	0	1
Lutheran	38	4	42
Disciples	5	19	24
United Church of Christ	0	5	5
Coptic	1	0	1
Nazarene	1	0	1
Mar Thoma	1	0	1
None	10	2	12
Totals	163	212	375

The new program of study and parish training leading to the D.B. degree was inaugurated in the Autumn Quarter, 1957. Forty-seven students in the four schools began their work under this new program. As many of you know, the D.B. curriculum is new in the following major respects: (1) it provides for a full year of service in a ministry between the second and third regular academic years, this service largely supported by the FTF and under the close oversight of the director of the program; (2) three quarters of course work in the second year designed to prepare students for the year of ministerial service; and (3) three quarters of course work in the

fourth year (the third academic year) aimed at the integration of the learning and experience gained during the preceding years. The program is also intended to lead *both* to generalized education in religion *and* to specialization at some depth in a particular field of study, and thus to combine the main features of our two types of D.B. curricula formerly provided by the faculty.

We are gratified with the reception received by this new venture in education for the ministry thus far and invite you to call the program to the attention of prospective ministerial candidates.

Cordially,

WALTER HARRELSON
Dean

CONVOCATION

At the Autumn Convocation on December 20, 1957, under the Federated Theological Faculty, the following degrees in the Divinity School were conferred:

Bachelor of Divinity:

HAROLD EUGENE BUTZ

DAVID CAMERON CASTO
A.B., Ohio Wesleyan University, 1953

CHARLES EUGENE COZADD

DONALD EVERETT CRANNELL

JAMES EVERMAN DAVIS
A.B., University of Chicago, 1951

Master of Arts:

ENN AINT ARIKE
A.B., Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1954

DOUGLAS ALLAN FOX
A.B., University of Sydney (Australia), 1953
Thesis: "Use of Martin Buber's 'I-Thou' Philosophy To Examine Process of Self-actualization in Adolescents To Determine Role of Church in This Period of Their Lives"

SUE ESTHER WIENHORST
A.B., Valparaiso University, 1951

NEW INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF STUDENT OPINION PUBLISHED

Quest, the new independent journal of student opinion in the Federated Theological Schools, is now including alumni subscriptions within its distribution program. There will be four issues during the course of the 1957–58 academic year. This publication is printed professionally and is sold at the price of twenty-five cents per issue. A limited supply of four-issue subscriptions are available to alumni for one dollar.

It is the purpose of this journal to encourage responsible student writing, promote critical and constructive scholarship, stimulate opinion and conversation concerning theological education, and foster conversation among fields of theological inquiry.

Mail subscriptions to William E. Palmer, Apt. 1B, 5477 Greenwood Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois.

[The following speech was given by Dr, Charles T. Holman at the annual dinner for the Federated Theological Faculty on October 16, 1957. Dr. Holman was selected by the Divinity School Board of Trustees as the 1957 Alumnus of the Year.—EDITOR.]

I'D DO IT AGAIN!

In my preaching I constantly warn my hearers about the danger of looking backward. Paul's advice about "forgetting the things which are behind" is good advice. It is better to look forward toward goals to be attained. Yet, fifty years in the ministry does seem to compel a backward look and some assessment of the wisdom of decisions made. James Curley, former mayor of Boston, has recently published his autobiography under the title, *I'd Do It Again.* I am not sure that if I were Mr. Curley I should want to do it all again. For myself, too, I should not want to do again everything just as I did it. But when it comes to the choice of the Christian ministry as a life-work, I echo Mr. Curley's sentiment. Most certainly, I'd do it again!

Viewing the matter from the vantage point of fifty years' experience, there are three reasons why I should again choose the Christian ministry as a life work if the decision had once more to be made.

The first reason is a quite frankly self-regarding one. *The Christian ministry opened the way to a wonderfully rich and varied experience.* There are few jobs that touch so many sides of life as does that of the minister. The world of culture is his, almost of necessity. He is a man of affairs, responsible for the administration of an important institution. And, by reason of his office, he wields considerable public influence. But, for me, these things were less important than the number and variety of human constants which the pastorate afforded. In my early ministry I lived with and preached to lumberjacks and settlers in the timber country of northern Ontario. On the western Canadian prairies I lived among and ministered to cowboys and homesteaders on the ranches and in newly opened country. I have been pastor in small town and large city churches. I served a church in a university city where my congregation was almost equally divided between town and gown. I spent five years as pastor of an English language Protestant Church in a Latin-American country where the membership was made of diplomatic personnel, men and women of specialized training serving with United Nations agencies and the American Point Four Program, representatives of foreign business interests, teachers, and with a good representation of nationals who had English as a second language. And, since returning to the United States, I have served as pastor of a suburban church. I cannot think of any profession which would have enabled me to share the life, and on very deep levels, of such a wide variety of persons. It has been an enriching experience.

Half of my career was spent as a teacher in the Divinity School, but even there, I confess, I thought of myself more as a minister than as a professor—

and probably my colleagues thought similarly of me. When I came to the Divinity School, first in 1913 as a student and later in 1923 as an assistant professor, I encountered a tremendously stimulating atmosphere. William Rainey Harper had gone, but Shailer Mathews, Gerald Birney Smith, J. M. P. Smith, E. J. Goodspeed, Ernest D. Burton, T. G. Soares, George Burman Foster, and Shirley Jackson Case were all here, and they were giving direction to American religious thought and action to a degree that, perhaps, has never been equaled by any other institution. Those were exciting days. My work brought me into close association with Shailer Mathews, for whom I came to entertain not only great admiration but deep affection. He was a great scholar, an able administrator, and a generous friend. For him the Christian faith was not just a matter for academic discussion but was something to be carried out in every area of personal and social living.

During World War II, I spent most of two years conducting seminars on counseling for Army and Navy chaplains, USO personnel, and later quite a variety of persons involved in counseling in industry, education, and social work. I visited Army camps and Navy training stations all over the country. I came to know something about the problems of soldiers and sailors and of many other persons living under stress, and I count it as one of the most valuable experiences of my life.

Altogether, then, I cannot think of any career which would have brought me as wide a variety of experiences or as many rich and rewarding human contacts as the Christian ministry has done.

The second reason why I would choose the Christian ministry as a life-work if I had it to do again is that it has *offered an unparalleled opportunity to serve men as they have faced the most trying and crucial experiences of life.* I do not belittle other callings. All work that meets human need can have a sacred quality. But we do scale our values, and the work of the minister is associated with the highest values and the most profound concerns of human existence. It is a great name, "minister," servant, that the pastor bears. I have had strong men, men for whom I have had the greatest respect, turn to me in some hour of trial or need, expecting that I might make available to them sources of courage and strength. It is a humbling experience, for no man can be equal to it except by the grace of God. I can hardly think of any perplexing or painful problem with which I have not been faced at some time. Sickness, death, and bereavement are part of the common round but never lose their poignancy and sharp surprise. There is the threatened breakup of the family, with all its painful consequences, which the minister is sometimes able to avert. There are the problems which parents face of erring boys and girls, and there are the acute and troubling problems which young people themselves bring to the minister. And there is the responsibility which the pastor faces at all times to lead men and women into the good life, the life of integrity and goodwill. And this, the minister finds, requires much more than preaching. He

must impart faith by the warm contagion of his own faith.

And the third reason that would compel the choice of the Christian ministry if the choice had once more to be made is because of the necessity by which the work of the minister is *identified with interests of transcendent concern to society* as well as to individuals. The world is in a ferment. New national and racial movements hold both menace and promise. The massive conflict of East and West terrifies us, and the doom of mankind literally hangs over our heads today. The areas of conflict and the threats that face us need not be enumerated; they are too well known. At bottom, all these conflicts await a religious solution, and the Christian faith shows the way. For the Christian faith stands for the breaking down of every wall of partition that separates a man from his brothers and the building of society on the foundation of a world-wide fraternity. It seeks to drive out rivalries, hatreds, and distrust and to make dominant in society intelligent goodwill. This does not mean that the minister is competent to give direction on the solution of economic and social problems; the problems are exceedingly complex and demand the best wisdom and experience of statesmen, social scientists, and many other specialists. But the answers must be found in the application of the teachings and spirit of Jesus. Most of us will remember how Bertrand Russell surprised his audience in closing a series of lectures at Columbia University three or four years ago. He had been discussing various areas of social conflict and steps which must be taken toward their resolution, and closed by saying, "The solution of these problems will be found only in the application of one very simple and old-fashioned virtue—so simple and old-fashioned that I am almost ashamed to speak of it in this company. And that is the virtue of love, of Christian compassion." And the Christian minister is commissioned to preach and endeavor to make regnant in all human relations this Christian virtue.

For these reasons, then, if I had the choice to make over again with regard to entering the Christian ministry, "I'd do it again!" I hope you will not think, since I have been so unblushingly autobiographical, that I feel I have done a good job. I am too conscious of many failures. But I will say that the times in which I have had the greatest satisfaction in my work have been those times in which I have made a spirited attempt to discharge my duties; and the times of disappointment and dissatisfaction have been those in which I have failed to meet my opportunities. "He hath anointed me to preach the Gospel," Jesus said of himself, and, humbly, every Christian minister must say that of himself. To preach that Gospel and try to live it has been my task these fifty years. I wish I might have done better, but I must leave in God's hands what has been done and trust that His blessing may rest upon it.

CHARLES T. HOLMAN

FACULTY NEWS

R. Pierce Beaver, Professor of Missions, served as a consultant to the Assembly of the International Missionary Council at University College, Achimota, near Accra, Ghana, which he attended during the early days of January, 1958. The government of Ghana conducted several colorful presentations for the delegates, and the Prime Minister of Ghana made a personal appearance. The Assembly attracted world-wide attention. Prior to the conference in Ghana, Dr. Beaver spent several days in Rome, where he met Professor Searle Bates (B.D. '53). They attended religious services together on Christmas Eve in Rome.

Henry Chadwick, Queens College, Cambridge, was Visiting Professor in Church History during the Autumn Quarter, 1957. He has been widely used as a speaker and lecturer at such schools as Union Seminary; the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee; Seabury-Western; McGill University; Trinity College, Toronto, Canada; and Yale. The courses which Dr. Chadwick taught while on campus were "Men and Movements of the Early Christian Church," and "Authority of the Early Christian Church."

Robert M. Grant, Associate Professor of New Testament, is the author of *The Letter and the Spirit,* published by SPCK in London last October. This is a book on the history and theory of ancient allegorical exegesis. He was asked recently to serve on the Board of Directors of the *Anglican Theological Review.* Also, Professor Grant was elected Vice-President of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at the December meeting of the Society in Louisville, Kentucky. His recent lecture tours included Toronto University, Yale, and Emory.

Ichiro Hori, Visiting Professor in the History of Religions, is here to give service for the Rockefeller Foundation Inter-religious Studies Research Project. He is doing research with Professor Kitagawa on aspects of Buddhism.

Joseph Kitagawa, Associate Professor in History of Religions, participated in the UNESCO Congress held in San Francisco in November. During the autumn months, the Church of the Holy Spirit, Lake Forest, Illinois, devoted a series of evenings to the subject, "Religions behind the Headlines," which was conducted by Dr. Kitagawa. Other recent presentations included a lecture on "Modern Trends in Buddhism," to the National Presbyterian Board's Outgoing Missionaries' Training Program at Mount Freedom, N.J.; on "Contemporary Buddhism" at the Chicago Lutheran Seminary in Maywood, Illinois; and on "Christianity and Non-Christian Religions" at the Iliff Theological School, Denver.

Charles H. Long, Instructor in History of Religions and Dean of Students in the Divinity School, spoke on World Community Day to the Council of Church Women, Sterling, Illinois. He was also chapel speaker at Kalamazoo College in November. As the keynote speaker for the Wisconsin District YM-YWCA Fall Conference held in Madi-

son, Wisconsin, Mr. Long gave three addresses.

SIDNEY E. MEAD, Professor of History of American Christianity and President of Meadville Theological School, during the fall months took part in a series of conferences conducted by various groups. These included a statement on "Theological Education" for the Southern Unitarian Council in Birmingham, Alabama, and a paper on "The Life and Work of Walter Rauschenbusch" for the Roger Williams Fellowship of the American Baptist Convention, held in Swift Hall Commons Room in early November. He was also a participant in the Prairie Group Conference of Unitarian Ministers at Pere Marquette State Park, Illinois, also held in November; was a contributor to the Rauschenbusch Colloquium held at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York City; and was a participant in a conference on the "History of Religion in the New World" held in Washington, D.C., and sponsored by the Pan-American Institute of History and Geography.

JAMES H. NICHOLS, Professor of Modern Church History, in November delivered one of the Norton Lectures at Hamilton College and the Swander Memorial Lectures at the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Dr. Nichols, who has been out of residence for the Autumn Quarter, has spent this time in research on nineteenth-century American intellectual and religious history as a Guggenheim Fellowship project. He has now resumed his teaching schedule.

VICTOR OBENHAUS, Associate Professor of the Church in Agricultural and Industrial Life, has had his book, *The Responsible Christian,* published by the University of Chicago Press.

JOSEPH SITTLER, Professor of Systematic Theology, was study leader and lecturer for the College of Preachers, Washington, D.C., a ministerial convocation, held early in November at the Washington Cathedral. Later in the same month he addressed the National Convention of the Religious Education Association at their annual meeting in Chicago. Mr. Sittler was consultant at the New England Student Christian Conference at Harvard University in December and was also the consultant for the United Lutheran Church Department of Worship which met in New York City a short time later. Several colleges and universities invited Mr. Sittler to preach in their chapels during the Autumn Quarter. These included Aurora College, Drew University, Lafayette College, Northwestern University, and Garrett Biblical Institute. He was the Commencement speaker for the January graduating class of the Chicago Teachers College.

JOHN B. THOMPSON, Dean of Rockefeller Memorial Chapel, recently visited the following college campuses as guest lecturer and preacher: DePauw University, Carleton College, Albion College, and Ripon College.

U PE MAUNG TIN, Visiting Professor of History of Religions, from Rangoon, Burma, was guest lecturer at the Midwest Fellowship of Professors of Mission, held at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Maywood, Illinois, in Octo-

ber; at the University Unitarian Church; and at the Disciples University Church. He has recently prepared the manuscript for a new elementary Pali language grammar, which will soon be published in the United States. The Burmese Ambassador to the United States, the Honorable Dr. U Win, was entertained by Mr. Maung Tin during Dr. Win's recent visit to Chicago.

GRANGER WESTBERG, Associate Professor of Religion and Health, gave one of the addresses at the Anniversary Banquet of the Department of Religion and Health of the National Council of Churches, held in New York City at the Riverside Church in November. Mr. Westberg also gave the first address ever given by a clergyman to the entire Medical School of the University of Rochester. In December he conducted a psychiatry and religion seminar on the campus of Berea College.

ALLEN P. WIKGREN, Chairman of the Department of New Testament and Early Christian Literature, spent the months of September–November in research on New Testament Greek and Armenian manuscripts in European libraries. He also read papers at international meetings of New Testament scholars in Birmingham and Oxford, England, and lectured at Aarhus and Uppsala Universities. Dr. Wikgren received the Distinguished Service citation as a member of the translation committee of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible from the National Council of Churches, in session at St. Louis in December. Former members of the Divinity School staff were also present, including Edgar J. Goodspeed and W. A. Irwin.

ALUMNI NEWS

MARTHA BATEMAN, '34, has retired from missionary service and has recently published several textbooks for African schools in an African dialect.

RUTH M. CAMPBELL, M.A. '30, was the 1956–57 chairman of the Scranton–Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania, Chapter of the National Association of Social Work.

LLOYD V. CHANNELS, B.D. '40, had his book, *The Layman Learns To Pray*, published in October, 1957. He has recently been elected to the chairmanship of the Board of Managers of the Michigan Christian Missionary Society.

CLAUDE D. DICKS, Ph.D. '47, has recently accepted the position as head of the Department of Philosophy at Alma College, Alma, Michigan.

CARL J. FURR, Ph.D. '37, has a new position in the Special Projects office of the Atomic Energy Commission at Washington, D.C. His last assignment was at the Pentagon, Special Warfare Division, evaluating intelligence for psychological warfare capabilities.

J. PAUL GOEBEL, M.A. '21, accepted a call in September, 1957, from the Mt. Pisgah United Church of Christ, Lawrenceville, Ohio, to serve as pastor.

GERALD JAMES GREGG, B.D. '56, was ordained in the Logansport Presbytery, on August 4, 1957, at the First Presby-

terian Church in South Bend, Indiana, which he now serves as Assistant Minister. Rector William N. Hawley, former Dean of the Divinity School, preached the ordination sermon.

GEORGE A. JOHNSON, Ph.D. '48, received the Jaycee Distinguished Service Award for Ashtabula, Ohio, for 1957.

JACK E. JONES, M.A. '43, spent seven weeks this past summer in Europe as a member of the "Peace and Spiritual Life Seminars," sponsored by the Baptist Pacifist Fellowship of the American Baptist Convention.

LEONORA A. DORSEY, '37, was married to D. J. Kilby on August 10, 1957. Mrs. Kilby has resigned her position at Stephens College, Missouri, where she was a residence counselor.

CARLETON LEE, Ph.D. '51, formerly at Tougaloo (Mississippi) Southern Christian College, is now Professor of Philosophy and Religion and Director of Religious Activities at Central State College, Wilberforce, Ohio.

GEORGE W. MARSHFIELD, '34–'37, is now the College Secretary for the New England region of the American Friends Service Committee.

OTTO MAYER, M.A. '17, accepted a call in November, 1957, from the Sauganash Community Church, Chicago, to serve as an Associate Minister.

ROBERT VAN MEIGS, B.S. '98, whose last acting pastorate was the Congregational Church, Interlachen, Florida, served as pastor emeritus of the Central Baptist Church, Quincy, Illinois, for several weeks this past summer.

ERNEST D. NIELSEN, Ph.D. '51, president of Grand View College, Des Moines, Iowa, spent a month last summer in his native Denmark. An article, written by Dr. Nielsen, called "Danish Schools Go Modern," giving his observations on education in Denmark, appeared in the *Des Moines Tribune* on October 4, 1957.

IRVEN PAUL, '38–'39, has accepted a position as Professor of Latin American Studies of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Connecticut.

CUTHBERT PRATT, '45–'48, was awarded the honorary degree of D.D. from Seabury-Western Theological Seminary in June, 1957. He was also graduated from Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y., in November, 1957, having received the degree of S.T.D.

MARY EDITH RUNYAN, M.A. '45, has been promoted from Associate Professor to Professor of Philosophy and Religion at Elmira College, Elmira, N.Y.

KARL V. SCHULTZ, M.A. '47, has an article being published by the *Journal of Clinical Psychology* entitled "The Psychologically Healthy Person: A Study in Identification and Prediction."

H. M. SHOUSE, B.D. '99, had the honorary degree of D.D. conferred upon him by Linda Vista Baptist College and Seminary, where he formerly served as a professor.

EUGENE S. TANNER, Ph.D. '34, is now established in Edinburgh until July, 1958, on the research leave granted him by the College of Wooster, Ohio.

ANDREW R. E. WYANT, B.D. '97, the oldest living alumnus of the Divinity School, continues to be active in community affairs. Recently he attended a luncheon with the YMCA Central Board of Management in Chicago, and attend-

ed the annual Phi Gamma Delta dinner at the University Club. He also finds it possible to be active in many church functions. (It was erroneously reported in the November, 1957, issue of the *News* that John W. Bailey is the oldest living alumnus—Dr. Wyant graduated with the B.D. degree in 1897, and Dr. Bailey came to study at the Divinity School in 1898.)

EARL F. ZEIGLER, M.A. '26, retired from the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., on December 31, 1957, where he has served for thirty-seven years. Westminster Press will publish his new book, *Christian Education of Adults,* early in 1958.

ATTENTION ALUMNI!

Help us to make our alumni records more complete. The Alumni Association urges every alumnus to send information about himself or other alumni. Please fill in this blank and return it to the Office of Extension, Divinity School, University of Chicago.

Name..... Address.....
U. of C. degrees..... Year.....
Other degrees..... Institutions..... Year.....
Mailing address.....
New pastorate or other position.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
Book published.....
Election to position of honor or responsibility.....
Interesting project recently accomplished.....
Any other information of interest.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

PRINTED IN U.S.A.